



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Editorial Notes.

President's Note to the Powers.

President Roosevelt is universally confessed to have done a most signal service to the cause of arbitration by securing the reference of the present Venezuela dispute to the Hague Court rather than arbitrating the trouble himself. The letter which he sent through Secretary Hay to the powers on the subject, which we herewith quote, is admirable both in what it says and in its tone. It was quoted by Chancellor von Buelow in the Reichstag, during his speech on the Venezuelan situation on the 20th ult.:

"The President appreciates to an extraordinary degree the honor that the powers have done him in asking him to act as arbitrator in settling their present difficulty with Venezuela. He would have been happy to meet the wishes of the powers and exert his best efforts for attaining so desirable a conclusion but for the fact that another and better way presents itself for settling this difficulty. The President has been of the opinion always that the whole controversy should be referred to the High Court of Arbitration at The Hague, since this Court was created by the most important powers of the world to settle questions like the present, which involve no questions of national honor or cession of territory."

Chile and Argentina.

Chile and Argentina have shown their good faith in the signing of the disarmament convention last spring by concluding the past month a supplementary agreement defining the steps to be taken to bring their navies to a parity and to effect the alienation of the vessels of war under construction. By this agreement Argentina pledges herself, the press dispatches state, to remove the small calibre guns from two cruisers, the "Garibaldi" and the "Pueyrredon," and Chile to do the same with the battleship "Captain Pratt." The ironclads of the two governments which were under construction in European ship yards at the time of the convention last spring, work on which was then suspended, are, under this new agreement, to be held by Great Britain until the two republics succeed in effecting a sale of them. No new ships are to be built or purchased for a specified period. There are doubtless other important details of the recent convention which the press dispatches have not given us. This convention, it is believed, marks the end of the long and ruinous rivalry in naval armaments between the two countries, growing out of their boundary dispute, recently settled, and their ambitions for naval supremacy in that part of the world. If this proves to be true, this small beginning of reduction of armaments may well hereafter rank as one of the most important events of the opening of the twentieth century. It is impossible to estimate

how great the blessing will be to these two progressive states, situated climatically in the most promising part of South America, to be free from the exhausting burdens of militarism and the constant irritations and clashings which would have resulted from the continuance of their former attitude toward each other. It is perfectly rational now to expect them to become leaders in the new pacific civilization which is more and more rapidly to make its conquest of the world.

The New Militia Law.

The Militia Bill, on which we commented briefly in an editorial in our last issue, has finally passed the Senate, been signed by the President, and thus become law. Before it passed the Senate two very important changes were made in it. Through the influence of Senator Bacon of Georgia (who made an important speech on the bill on the 16th and 17th of December) and others, the insidious provision in Article 24 for the establishment of a National Volunteer Reserve of one hundred thousand men, to be subject only to the call of the President and to the military duty prescribed by Congress, was stricken out. The purpose of this article, as it originally stood, was in this indirect way to enlarge the standing army. But still more important, from the point of view of religious liberty, was the amendment to Article 2 exempting from military service those who on religious grounds are opposed to war. This amendment was secured at the last moment, when the bill was on its third reading, through the efforts of the Committee on Legislation of the Five Years' Meeting of the Society of Friends. A number of very influential senators supported the appeal of the Friends' Committee, among whom were Beveridge of Indiana, Hoar of Massachusetts and Depew of New York. Mr. Thomas Butler, a Representative from Pennsylvania, did much to influence the Senate to adopt the exemption amendment. Here is the amendment in full:

"Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to require or compel any member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing whose creed forbids its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein, in accordance with the creed of said religious organization, to serve in the militia or any other armed or volunteer force under the jurisdiction and authority of the United States."

This is a great triumph for the principles of anti-war people. We should have been glad if the provision had gone further and exempted the individuals, of whom the number is steadily growing, who in religious bodies not having an anti-war creed are on religious grounds just

as strongly opposed to war as those here exempted. Indeed, the exemption ought logically to be extended to all who believe war always to be wrong. We have no doubt, however, that in a case of actual trial such persons would be exempted from service under the general principle of this article.

Alaskan Boundary.

On January 24 Secretary Hay and Sir Michael Herbert, the new British ambassador, signed a treaty providing for the settlement, or a new effort at settlement, of the long disputed Alaska boundary question. The treaty provides for the reference of the question to a mixed commission of six persons, three to be appointed by the United States and three by Great Britain. The chief matters with which the commission will, under the treaty, have to deal will be the interpretation to be placed on the treaty of 1825, between Great Britain and Russia, which defined the boundary between British America and Alaska, and that of the treaty of 1867, between Russia and the United States, as to the extent of the territory ceded to the United States. It is to be sincerely hoped that this new commission may not go the way of the now defunct Joint High Commission appointed some four or five years ago to settle the controversy. The composition of the commission, three on a side, will make a deadlock very easy from the start. The contention of the United States, if it is to be established before this body, will have to be presented strongly enough to win one at least of the British commissioners to the view of our government, and *vice versa*. It is understood that this sort of a commission was the only kind that could be secured. How much simpler would it have been to have referred the whole matter to the Hague Court. This commission may of course be able to settle the matter promptly. If the case is anything like as one-sided as it is claimed to be on both sides, six such men as will be named on the commission will be able to come to a practically unanimous agreement. If the commission should divide on the question, as the former commission did, then resort will be had to the Permanent Court. The governments have missed a great opportunity to give the Hague tribunal, which they were among the foremost in creating, the prestige which would have come from the adjudication of a case of the first importance.

The Canal and Arbitration.

The Panama Canal Treaty was made public by the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on January 24. By the terms of the treaty the United States agrees to pay Colombia ten million dollars cash, and after nine years an annual rental of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Sovereignty over the canal strip is retained by Colombia, but the lease is practically perpetual. The Panama Canal Company is to receive forty million dollars for its rights and possessions. The strip of land leased to the United States is ten kilometers wide, including three marine miles of sea at each terminus of the canal. Rights of private owners in the zone are not interfered with. The United States is authorized to construct at each terminus a free port for vessels, lighthouses and other aids. The canal and the entrances thereto are to be neutral in perpetuity. The United States is to have authority to protect and make secure the canal and its auxiliary works and dependencies, to enforce such police and sanitary regulations as it may deem necessary, and to protect navigation and commerce through and over the canal, railroads, etc. Colombia may establish judicial tribunals within the zone for controversies between her own citizens and between Colombians and any foreigners except citizens of the United States, which will have the power to set up tribunals for controversies between its own citizens or between its citizens and those of any other nation except Colombia. Joint tribunals are to be established for controversies between citizens of the United States and Colombia, and between citizens of all other countries than the United States and Colombia. Colombia is to have the free use of the canal for vessels at all times. The forces necessary for the protection of the canal, if any should ever be required, are ordinarily to be furnished by Colombia; in exceptional cases, temporarily by the United States. The United States agrees to have the canal ready for use in fourteen years after the ratification of the treaty, if no unforeseen hindrances arise. One of the most important provisions of the treaty is that for a joint commission of four persons, with power to appoint an umpire, which shall have full power to settle all disputes as to indemnities to land owners along the canal route, as to the value of expropriated lands and waters, and as to the carrying out of sanitary regulations, etc.,—in general, of all disputes in connection with carrying out the provisions of the treaty.

National Antagonisms.

We desire to call the special attention of all our readers to a very able and instructive article entitled "National Antagonisms—an Illusion," by the distinguished sociologist, J. Novicow of Odessa, Russia, in the current number of the *International Quarterly* (Burlington, Vt.). The article is an elaborate one of twenty-six pages, and it would be impossible to give any adequate idea of the scope and power of the argument by brief quotations. Under the title of "National Antagonisms—an Illusion," the paper is really a plea for a great international world organization, for the sake of the larger and fuller devel-

opment of the interests of all men everywhere. If any one does not believe that the time has come for further development toward such an organization by the creation of the Stated International Congress, to which this number of our paper is so largely devoted, Mr. Novicow's article will not leave room for any further doubt. His treatment of the subject is both destructive and constructive. He shows, with great wealth of learning, that national antagonisms are not, as they are by many believed to be, promotive of the real advantage of any single nation, but that they are always a delusion and a snare, destructive in general and in particular. He then depicts in a remarkable way what prosperity would result from the "association of all mankind," from the solidarity which he holds to be "the most positive and tangible of realities." "What will mankind be when it produces only and destroys nothing? What will it become when the time spent in casting cannon, erecting fortifications, building ironclads and drilling soldiers shall be regarded as utterly lost?" "With almost mathematical certainty we can predict that so soon as the day of work solely productive shall have at length fully dawned, the welfare and well-being of the race will be at least tenfold that of our times." "The fullness of time has come. We are no longer ignorant, as were our rude ancestors. Science has extended our intellectual horizon. We include the whole earth at a single glance. A man like Mr. Pierpont Morgan moves his financial arms over a chessboard that comprises the five continents. We understand from now on quite definitely that the maximum of happiness for each individual can be realized only by the complete association of the race. We understand that the formation of such an association constitutes our most concrete, most immediate, most material and most *selfish* interest." But to understand the force of these pithy utterances one must read Mr. Novicow's entire article.

Honor to the President. How President Roosevelt's service in securing the reference of the Venezuela trouble to the Hague Court is appreciated among the friends of the Court in Europe may be judged from the following letter, written to the President on the 28th of December by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, one of the French members of the Court:

"*Mr. President:* Many Frenchmen and other Europeans are glad to join with us in expressing the gratitude due to you for the generous firmness with which you have acted in the service of international justice. We in Europe constantly speak of American competition, and this material competition has its advantages in that it stimulates us. But you have inaugurated during the past six months a moral competition more far-reaching than the other. By your example on two occasions you have compelled governments to remember their duties

in face of the manifold difficulties which the changes in the world have brought about. The Court of Arbitration at The Hague at least has secured for them the resources and the machinery of a Court instituted by common consent and always ready. This Court was boycotted; by a tacit and truly unprogressive understanding a conspiracy of silence was established against it on the morrow of the day on which it was created. It was about to succumb to ill-will when on the first occasion you came forward to protest against an attack which threatened the liberties of the world. To the Republic of the United States and to that of Mexico belong the honor of having opened in Europe, and before the eyes of passive Europe, the Court of Arbitration at The Hague. This lesson should have been sufficient, but it is humiliating to have to admit that not a single authoritative voice has been raised to remind the nations of the obligations imposed by Article XXVII. of the Hague Convention, obligations which they themselves formally entered into only three years ago, after those memorable discussions which actually constituted the first formal parliament of mankind. The initiative of the United States as opposed to the inertness of Europe is a sign of the times which Europeans should have the courage to recognize. Honor to your government, which has understood that in face of the general abstention it was its duty to awaken the other States from their lethargy and to set forth again upon the path of noble and liberal ideas of justice and progress, which was too soon abandoned.

"I beg you, Mr. President, to accept the assurance of my high esteem and sincere devotion.

"D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT."

The Customs Congress.

The Customs Congress, which has been sitting in New York since the 16th of January, is another illustration of the necessity which the nations now find themselves under of frequently investigating together, by official representatives, the important questions constantly arising and developing which affect their mutual relations. This Congress grew out of the deliberations of the Pan-American Congress, which found itself unable, because of lack of time and the large number of subjects with which it had to deal, to examine thoroughly the various aspects of the trade relations of the American republics. So it arranged for this New York Congress, to study the whole subject. Most of the nations of this hemisphere are represented in the gathering, twelve of them having delegates present at the opening. The Congress is considering the commercial systems and trade regulations of the various countries, with a view to an agreement for the removal of unnecessary charges and restrictions, and that laws affecting vessels and the handling of merchandise may be made such as to give the greatest convenience in commercial intercourse. The work is being done in committees, and not much of it is yet sufficiently advanced to be made public. There are committees on vessels, on merchandise, on nomenclature,

on future congresses and permanent organization, etc. The inaugural exercises of the Congress took place on the 17th of January, and addresses were made to the delegates by Mayor Low and Secretary of the Treasury Shaw. Ex-Mayor Grace is chairman of the Congress, and Treasurer Shaw's private secretary, Robert B. Armstrong, is secretary. The Congress has in it many men prominent in commercial circles, the shipping business, in custom house work, etc. Its conclusions and recommendations will be awaited with great interest by all who are anxious to see friendly intercommunication and better trade relations developed to the largest extent possible.

**Tolstoy on
Violence.**

One of the latest expressions of Count Leo Tolstoy's views of the character of violence is the following letter, written by him in December last to Herbert Welsh of Philadelphia:

"*Dear Sir:* I received your letter, book and pamphlets. I cannot help to admire your activity, but the crimes which have been committed in the Philippines are special cases, which by my opinion will always occur in states governed by violence, or in which violence is admitted as necessary and lawful. Violence, which in itself is a crime, cannot be used to a certain extent. When it is admitted it will always transgress the limits which we would put to it. Deeds as those that have been done in the Philippines, in China, and are daily done in all pseudo-Christian states, will continue till humanity will not accept violence as a means to produce good results, and will accept the chief precepts of Christianity to act on our brethren, not as an animal by violence, but by 'sweet reasonableness' (as Matthew Arnold termed it), which is the only way to act thoroughly and durably on reasonable beings. Hoping that my bad English will not hinder you to understand what I mean to say, I remain, dear sir,

"Yours truly,

"15 Dec., 1902.

"LEO TOLSTOY."

**Wireless
Messages.**

The wireless wizard has again triumphed. On the 17th of January, without sending any signal of what he was about to do, he transmitted from the Cape Cod station to the Cornwall station, three thousand miles, the following message from President Roosevelt to King Edward:

His Majesty, Edward VII., London, Eng.:

In taking advantage of the wonderful triumph of scientific research and ingenuity which has been achieved in perfecting a system of wireless telegraphy, I extend, on behalf of the American people, most cordial greetings and good wishes to you and to all the people of the British empire.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WASHINGTON, JAN. 17, 1903.

It is no wonder that King Edward and his people, after receiving such a friendly greeting as this right through nobody knows what, are ashamed of what is

being done in their name on the shores of Venezuela. King Edward replied as follows, the message being sent from the Cornwall station to Cape Breton and then repeated down to Cape Cod:

The President, White House, Washington, America:

I thank you most sincerely for the kind message which I have just received from you through Marconi's transatlantic wireless telegraphy. I sincerely reciprocate, in the name of the people of the British empire, the cordial greetings and friendly sentiment expressed by you on behalf of the American nation, and I heartily wish you and your country every possible prosperity.

EDWARD R. AND I.

SANDRINGHAM, JAN. 19, 1903.

John Bright used to say, when speaking of England and the United States, "two nations, one people." One can imagine that the great orator and statesman of peace, if he had lived to see the triumph of wireless telegraphy, would have enlarged the thought into "all nations, one people." For it is difficult to see how the nations can ever wrangle and fight again when they are all so soon to be brought into immediate contact, through this marvelous invention, in a way never dreamed of before. Wireless telegraphy is to outdo hereafter all now known instruments of international unity and peace. We are not dreaming!

**The Golden
Rule Mayor.**

Mayor Jones of Toledo, who has been doing his best, under the circumstances, to put the Golden Rule into practice in the government of the city, says: "I am aware of the fact that many people believe in the virtue of brute force, but I do not. For my part, I would be glad to see every revolver and every club (policeman's) in the world go over Niagara Falls or, better still, over the brink of hell." "There are two methods of dealing with people whose liberty makes them a menace to society: on the one hand, prisons, penalties, punishment, hatred and hopeless despair; and on the other, asylums, sympathy, love, help and hope." The following account is given by the *Whim* of the manner in which Mr. Jones, while filling the place of a police judge one day, treated a tramp who had been found drunk, with a loaded pistol on his person: "The mayor held the pistol up so that every one could see it, and declared that it was a devilish weapon intended solely to kill human beings. It was worse than useless; it was hellish, and worse than whiskey a thousand times. The prisoner was sentenced to smash his revolver to pieces with a sledge-hammer, and the court adjourned to an adjoining room to see the sentence carried out. As they went out the mayor laid his arm affectionately over the shoulder of the prisoner, who grasped his hand with a sudden pressure that indicated how little he had expected the unusual sentence. Meanwhile the mayor

gave him some good advice. The policeman put the pistol in a vise, the prisoner was given a sledge-hammer, and in an instant he had smashed the weapon to fragments and was a free man again." It is probable that this unfortunate man went away with a lot of new thoughts whirling in his head, and with more incentives to reform than he had ever known after he became a drunkard. Was the city in any increased danger because of this Golden Rule experiment?

Brevities.

. . . The British government has appointed Sir John Ardagh a member of the Hague Court, to fill the place made vacant by the death of Lord Pauncefoot. Sir John Ardagh was one of the British deputation to the Hague Conference, and has served on a number of important international commissions and been a member of several international congresses.

. . . The peace cause in Europe has met with a great loss in the death of Baron von Suttner. He and the Baroness were the centre of the important group of peace advocates in Austro-Hungary, and were always together at the peace congresses. He was a most ardent and intelligent supporter of the cause, and his fine, manly, energetic presence will long be remembered by all who had the good fortune to know him. We extend to the Baroness our sincerest sympathies in the great bereavement that has come to her.

. . . The *New York World* says: "The United States was a world power, and its Monroe doctrine was successfully asserted and universally respected, before Mr. Roosevelt was born or the little Spanish war was dreamed of. It never was stronger than to-day and never less in need of the 'best navy in the world.'"

. . . The *Presbyterian Banner* says: "War, as Emerson says, is on its last legs. It is getting to be disgraceful. The nation that now enters upon it must in some degree justify itself before the bar of the civilized world. It is a diminishing factor in civilization, and the angels' song is beginning to wreath the cannon's mouth with the flowers of peace."

. . . Samuel Morris of Philadelphia, in a letter to the editor of *City and State* on the cruelties of the campaign in the Philippines, says of war in general: "It is this morally benumbing influence, which is more or less distinctly to be observed throughout a nation when engaged in war, that is among the most injurious and deplorable in its results. Our aim, therefore, must be continually to press home upon the right reason and conscience of our people, not only the horrors and vices inseparable from the system, but that a resort to arms is utterly at variance with the highest interests of a nation, let the object in view be what it may."

. . . Speaking of the testing at Sandy Hook of the largest and most powerful gun ever cast in the United States, the *Boston Globe* says that "a whole shipload of these savage toys is not worth a single Marconigram."

. . . The *Boston Herald* of January 18 said: "It seems to us that the suggestion of the American Peace Society (for a stated international congress) embodies an exceedingly important advance in civilization."

. . . The *Pulpit*, said to be the only magazine of sermons in the country, recently contained a sermon on "The Moral Standard for our Nation," — a strong peace discourse, — by Rev. Scott F. Hershey, LL. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Boston and one of the directors of the American Peace Society.

. . . The statement was correct that the Nobel peace prize for 1902 was given in equal parts to Mr. Elie Ducommun, secretary of the International Peace Bureau, and to Dr. Albert Gobat, secretary of the Interparliamentary Peace Union's Bureau, both of Berne, Switzerland. The money was well bestowed upon two most worthy and indefatigable workers. Our congratulations to them both.

. . . Hon. William I. Buchanan of Buffalo, ex-Minister to the Argentine Republic and delegate of the United States to the Pan-American Conference in Mexico City last winter, writes: "I am very glad to note your work before the Massachusetts legislative body (in the matter of a stated international congress), and it seems to me your efforts ought to be crowned with success."

. . . Albert de Berzeviczy, privy councilor of Austro-Hungary and member of the Hungarian Chamber of Deputies, has been appointed a member of the Hague Court to fill the place vacated by M. de Szilagy.

. . . The frightful results of warlike measures are often found in the most unexpected places. A Dutch cruiser which arrived at La Guayra, Venezuela, on the 21st of January, from the Island of Los Roques, whose inhabitants are mostly charcoal burners trading with La Guayra, reported that it found that twelve men and five women on the island had died of hunger and thirst as a result of the blockade which prohibited schooners from carrying provisions and water to the island.

. . . In its annual report to the Secretary of War the Philippine Commission recommends the establishment of the gold standard in the islands, a reduction of seventy-five per cent. of the Dingley tariff rates, and the admission of a limited number of Chinese skilled laborers into the islands.

. . . The Mad Mullah has declared that his conflict with England, which has brought on the "Somali Campaign," was because England's "protected" native allies had "invaded his territory." His territory is wanted!

. . . At the annual meeting of the Birmingham (England) Small Arms Company some weeks ago Mr. Herbert Chamberlain, brother of the Colonial Secretary, said that "the profit made was the largest reported in any twelvemonth of the Company's history. They could pay practically a forty per cent. dividend in cash." And he no doubt therefore rejoiced inwardly that they had had such a good war!